

Chapter 5 - Consultation and Coordination

5.1 Summary of Scoping

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) ensures that environmental information is available to citizens and public officials before decisions are made and before actions are taken. It also provides a regulatory avenue for private citizens and organizations to express their opinions which may influence the proposed action. Scoping meetings are held early in the planning and decision-making process to establish effective and open communication with the public.

Scoping is an open process designed to determine the breadth of issues to be addressed in the EIS. It is intended to obtain the views of the public; state, local, and tribal governments; and other federal agencies. By involving the public through the scoping process, the proponent: develops a comprehensive list of issues, then identifies the significant issues for study, aids in the development of additional alternatives, and ensures that the EIS is balanced and thorough.

Scoping also assesses the level of public interest in the project and identifies the agencies, groups, and individuals likely to be most interested in the proposed project. Scoping can have a profound and positive effect on the issues to be examined within the EIS, the environmental analyses, and, ultimately, on the decision made.

The Kelsey Whisky scoping period began with a published Notice of Intent in the Federal Register dated June 7, 1999 (Volume 64, No.108, Pg.30353). It was placed on the District web page the following week. Concurrently, a letter indicating our intent to prepare an EIS and hold scoping meetings, was distributed to local, state, federal and tribal agencies, industry and environmental organizations and the interested public. A news release and legal notices in local papers was also completed on June 10-11, 1999. Legal notice was also published on October 14, 1999 in local papers for an additional scoping meeting on October 21, 1999.

Three public scoping meetings were held to solicit public input into issues and content of the EIS. These occurred on:

June 22, 1999	Grants Pass Council Chambers	5 participants
July 20, 1999	Galice Community Hall	6 participants
October 21, 1999	Medford District Office	4 participants

Each of these meetings utilized an open house format, although occasional roundtable discussions did occur. Comments were also received by mail and internet throughout this time period. A total of 23 comment letters have been received to date.

In addition, in June 2000 a full color, fold-out flier was mailed to all parties who had requested information on the project or who had attended a meeting. This flier contained a summary of the scoping process and the comments received up to that time, as well as the concepts being considered in developing the proposed alternatives, including a set of maps showing potential land use allocation changes.

In the Notice of Intent, it was stated that written comments would be accepted until August 3, 1999, but comments have been accepted and included in the development of alternatives and analysis of effects through March, 2001.

A summary of comments includes:

- Request that BLM consider decommissioning of roads other than arterial for restoration, reduction of disease spread, reduce annual maintenance costs and recreational enhancement.
- Request that BLM continue to maintain roads utilized by recreationists and private land owners in the area.
- Request that BLM have no ground disturbing activity in LSR including timber harvesting.
- Request that the roadless area remain roadless with no ground disturbing activities such as timber sales or road construction to reduce habitat fragmentation and improve connectivity.

- Raised a concern over increasing fire potential and encouraged consideration of projects to reduce potential including limited access for suppression efforts.
- Request that no further recreational projects be located in EIS area. Have enough recreationist opportunities now. Keep access to Rogue River in area minimized.
- Request that BLM strongly consider, and do detailed analysis on No Action Alternative.
- Request that BLM inventory all roads, ways and trails in roadless area. Also analyze entire roadless area north and south of river, not just north.
- Request that BLM again reconsider Zane Grey area as wilderness.
- Supported logging in “Zane Grey” roadless area.
- Opposed any logging in “Zane Grey” roadless area. Cites severe potential impacts to recreation and wildlife adjacent to the Wild and Scenic River.
- Request that BLM gate more roads to reduce problems of illegal activities such as marijuana growing due to remoteness of area. Also reduces problems associated with road hunters such as increased fire hazard, garbage and road damage.
- Request increased emphasis on inventorying anadromous fish streams and riparian habitat, to get an accurate picture of needs or fish species in that specific area.

One area of a shared view was the concern for increased risk from wildland fires. While most agreed that an active program to reduce this risk was warranted, there was disagreement on where and how this should be accomplished.

Another area of shared concern was the protection of the Late Successional Reserve (LSR), forest dependent ecosystems and connectivity of habitat for species dispersal. Again, how, where, and how much is necessary varied greatly among respondents. Many felt some continued active management could occur while still protecting these values, while others felt total protection of the area from any development was the only reasonable approach for maintaining these ecosystems. It was also suggested that our analysis of this issue be done considering the whole watershed on both sides of the Rogue River, not just the north side.

A large number wanted reconsideration of the “Zane Grey Area” for wilderness status. In addition there was strong support for “decommissioning” of roads and designation of large portions of the EIS area as “roadless.” There was also uniform agreement for the protection of all existing property and access rights for private landholders in the area.

A comment letter was received from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, expressing concern with the proposal to change LSR boundaries in an area where existing Critical Habitat for Marbled Murrelets would be changed from LSR to General Forest Management Area (GFMA). If this change were to be selected and implemented, some of the forest stands within the critical habitat could potentially be subject to commercial timber harvest.

With the proposal to change land use allocations in some of the alternatives, it is possible that an amendment to the Medford District Resource Management Plan would be necessary. The analysis of environmental effects was designed to fully explore the consequences of such a decision. Thus, this EIS has the potential for resulting in an RMP amendment. This represents a change since the original Notice of Intent to conduct an EIS was published.

5.2 Final Environmental Impact Statement

A Federal Register Notice of availability for the draft EIS was published by the Environmental Protection Agency on April 12, 2002. Comments were requested for a period of 90 days, in compliance with 43 CFR 1610.2(e). The comment period closed July 12, 2002. One hundred-forty four public comment letters and emails were received and reviewed by the Field Office. Two on-site field reviews were provided to two separate landowners.

Comments were addressed in one of two ways: 1) a BLM response was provided and can be found in Appendix 15 and 2) the EIS was revised to incorporate either a clarification, additional detail, or a correction. In the case of text revision, the comment/response table may simply mention a comment and refer the reader back to a section in the FEIS.

In some instances, the comments provided no new information and so were not mentioned, or a response was made to add clarification to the reader.

5.3 Planning Consistency

The Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), Title II, Section 202, provides guidance for the land use planning system of the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to coordinate planning efforts with Native American Indian tribes, other Federal departments, and agencies of the state and local governments. In order to accomplish this directive, the Bureau of Land Management is directed to keep informed of state, local, and tribal plans; assure that consideration is given to such plans; and to assist in resolving inconsistencies between such plans and Federal planning. The section goes on to state in Subsection c) (9) that “*Land use plans of the Secretary under this section shall be consistent with State and local plans to the maximum extent he finds consistent with Federal law and the purposes of this Act.*”

The provisions of this section of FLPMA are echoed in Section 1610.3 of the BLM Resource Management Planning regulations. In keeping with the provision of this section, state, local and tribal officials were made aware of the planning process through the previously described mailings and meetings.

According to Section 1610.4-7 of the Bureau of Land Management Resource Planning Regulations, the Final Environmental Impact Statement is provided to the Governor, other Federal agencies, state and local governments, and Native American Indian tribes for comment. The resulting comments will be addressed in the final EIS. The formal 60-day consistency review by the Governor will occur after the Final EIS is published, as outlined in 1610.3-2(e) of the BLM Planning Regulations.

5.3.1 Federal Agencies

This Final EIS is believed to be consistent with the following plans of other federal agencies:

- The Record of Decision on the 1994 *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl*.
- The Record of Decision on the 2000 *Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for Amendment to the Survey and Management, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standard and Guidelines*.
- The Forest Service’s forest wide land and resource management plans for the adjacent Rogue River (1990) and Siskiyou (1993) National Forest.
- National Resource Conservation Service watershed plans.
- The Endangered Species Act and the following Fish and Wildlife Service plans:
 - Pacific Bald Eagle Recovery Plan
 - Final Draft Northern Spotted Owl Recovery Plan
 - Fish and Wildlife Service determination of critical habitat for the Northern Spotted Owl
 - Peregrine Falcon Recovery Plan
- The Bonneville Power Administration’s latest annual Transmission System Facilities Resource Program.
- The Northwest Power Planning Council, Columbia River Basin, Fish and Wildlife Program, and subordinate species-specific strategies.

5.3.2 State Government

The Final EIS is believed to be consistent with the following plans, programs, and policies of State of Oregon agencies:

- Department of Environmental Quality
 - Smoke Management Plan
 - Visibility Protection Plan and air quality policies
 - Prevention of Significant Deterioration requirements
- Water Resources Department river basin programs for the Rogue River
- Water Resources Commission rules and statutes
- Department of Agriculture
 - Weed control plans
 - State-listed endangered plant species
- Division of State Lands
 - Removal - Fill Law
 - Oregon Natural Heritage Program
- Parks and Recreation Department
 - Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan
 - State Parks and Recreation System Plan
 - State Recreation Trails Plan
 - State Historic Preservation Program
 - State Scenic Waterways Program and related projects
- Department of Transportation, Highway Division
 - Oregon Highway Plan
- Economic Development Department, Regional Economic Development Strategies

5.3.3 Local Government

The Oregon statewide planning program attached substantial importance to the coordination of federal plans with acknowledged local comprehensive plans. To the extent that BLM actions and programs are consistent with acknowledged county and city comprehensive plans and land use regulations, they can also be considered consistent with statewide planning goals. Local plans do not, however, address protection of Goal 5 values from the effects of forest management, as state law prohibits local government from regulating forest practices.

5.4 Final EIS Distribution List and Availability on the Internet

5.4.1 Distribution List

The Final Environmental Impact Statement is being sent to the following individuals, groups, and organizations. The list includes elected officials; federal agencies; state and local government agencies; American Indian Tribes and Nations; libraries; organizations; and individuals.

5.4.1.1 Elected Officials

United States Senator Gordon Smith
United States Senator Ron Wyden
United States Representative Peter DeFazio
United States Representative Greg Walden
Coos County Board of Commissioners
Curry County Board of Commissioners
Josephine County Board of Commissioners
Douglas County Board of Commissioners
Oregon State Governor Ted Kulongoski

5.4.1.2 Federal Agencies

Department of Agriculture -
Forest Service
Siskiyou National Forest -
Forest Supervisor
Forest Biologist
Gold Beach Ranger District
Grants Pass
Umpqua National Forest-Tiller Ranger District
Natural Resource Conservation Service-Josephine Soil and Water Conservation District
Department of Commerce-National Marine Fisheries Service
Department of Defense-U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Department of Interior -
Bureau of Land Management
Coos Bay District
Roseburg District
Bureau of Reclamation
Fish and Wildlife Service-Oregon State Office
Geological Survey
Environmental Protection Agency -
EIS Filing Section
Region 10 Office
Federal Energy Regulatory Commission

5.4.1.3 State and Local Government Agencies

State of Oregon -
Department of Environmental Quality
Medford
Portland
Department of Fish & Wildlife -
Rogue District Office, Central Point
Gold Beach
Roseburg
Charleston
Department of Forestry -
Central Point Office
Coos Bay District
Roseburg Office
Merlin Office
Historic Preservation Office
Marine Board
Curry County-Fire Protection Agency
Douglas County-Fire Protection Agency
Josephine County-Forestry Department
City of Glendale

Rogue Valley Council of Governments
Umpqua Regional Council of Governments
University of Texas-Zoology Department

5.4.1.4 American Indian Tribes and Nations

Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde
Confederated Tribes of Siletz
Confederated Tribes of the Rogue-Table Rock and Associated Tribes
Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians
Klamath Tribe
Quartz Valley Indian Reservation

5.4.1.6 Organizations

Benson Gulch Water Users' Association
Benton Mines, Inc./Dutch Mining LLC
Benton Mines, Inc./Lewis Investment Company
C and D Lumber Company
Friends of Oregon Living Waters
Galice Resort
Glendale CART
Headwaters
Indian Hill LLC
International Right-of-Way Association, Chapter 3
Klamath Siskiyou Wildlands Center
Lower Rogue Watershed Council
Larry Brown and Associates
Middle Rogue Watershed Council
Northwest Timber Affiliates, Inc.
Oregon Hunters Association-Rogue Valley Chapter
Oregon Natural Resources Council -
 Eugene
 Klamath Falls
 Crescent City, CA
Oregon Ridge and River Excursions
Oregon Trout
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
Oregon Historic Trails Advisory Council
Riverhawks
Siskiyou Audubon Society
Siskiyou Project
Southern Oregon Timber Industry Association
Spaulding and Son, Inc.
Sundance Expeditions, Inc.
Sunny Wolf CRT
Superior Lumber Company
SW Miner's Association
Umpqua Basin Watershed Council
Umpqua Watersheds/Cow Creek Council
Up The Creek Resources
Western Utility Group

5.4.1.7 Individuals

Shelly Akina
Skip Alexander
Bill and Leona Bazor
Howard and Ivy Beach
Norm and Buni Borreson

Bradley Boyden and Marie Del Toro
Frank and Jane Boyden
Charlie Boyer
Al and Debbie Brinkenhoff
Paul and Kathryn Brooks
Bob and Lori Brown
Dave and Mary Kay Byers
Ron and Carol Byrd
Gerald Casey
Pete and Betty Cazemire
Loran J. Cooper, Jr.
Bruce and Lori Crawford
Romain Cooper
Joe Cubic
Joel Despain
Jim and Florence Doty
Sherry Dwight
Barry and Kathy Eames
Tom and Gail Engles
Glenn and Diann Fly
Betty Fox
Larry Gaffney
Geoff Garcia
Betty Gaustad
Greg and Linda Gilpin
Robert James Glenn
Jon Gurdin
Darrel and Jennifer Hanks
BA and Lee Hanten
Michelle Hanten
Steve and Ruth Kahn
Vladmir Kovalik
Spencer Lennard
Katherine Lysaght
Randy Mack
Jim and Elenor Matney, Sr.
Carrol Maurer
David McClane
Cliff and Pattie McKeen
Brian McKnight
Warren Merz
Frank Moody
Larry Mullinnix
Dave and Jill Olerich
Judo and Shelly Paterson
Boyd Peters
Steve Polinger
Jim and Pat Price
Dave and Marilyn Prow
Paul and Sandra Quinn
Jelly Radcliff
Joyce Rector
Dave and Sherry Saunders
Jim Sigel
Sam and Linda Simpson
Bob and Jean Smith
Larry and Marie Smith
Monica Speltz
Richard Spotts
Chuck Steahly
Dave Stewart
Kindler Stout

Jack and Cheryl Strubel
Ron and Gwen Thomas
Gil and MariLou Thomason
Barbara Ullian
Jerry and Lynn Walker
Ken and Lynn Wegner
Forest Wilson
Dorothy Woodcock
Ronald Yockim

5.4.2 Internet Availability

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will be available on the internet at [<http://www.or.blm.gov/Medford/>](http://www.or.blm.gov/Medford/)

5.5 List of Preparers

Bob Bessey, Fish Biologist, M.S. and B.S. University of Washington, 25 years BLM.

Michael Bornstein, Wildlife Biologist, M.A. University of Colorado, B.S. Colorado State University, 2 years BLM, 19 years US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Jim Brimble, Forester, Silviculture, B.S. Texas A&M University, 21 years BLM.

Randy Bryan, Lead Engineer, B.T. Oregon Institute of Technology, 26 years BLM.

Leslie Frewing-Runyon, Economist, B.A. Willamette University, 13 years BLM.

Doug Goldenberg, Botanist, M.S. Oregon State University, B.S. Humboldt State University, 12 years BLM and US Forest Service.

Kerry Haller, Recreation Planner, B.S. Texas Tech. University, 12 years BLM.

Brian Keating, Fuels Management Specialist, M.S. University of Arizona, B.A. Loyola University Chicago, 4 years BLM, 3 years U.S. Forest Service.

Michelle Kohns, Biological Technician and editorial assistant, B.S. University of Kansas, 2 years BLM, season NPS.

Layne Lange, Natural Resource Specialist, B.S., University of Wisconsin, 22 years BLM.

Jim Leffman, Outdoor Recreation Planner, M.A. Oregon State University, B.S. Southern Oregon University, 24 years BLM.

Martin Lew, Natural Resource Specialist, B.S. Humboldt State University, 2 years BLM, 20 years U.S. Forest Service.

Tom McVey, Fuels Management Specialist, B.S. West Virginia University, 27 years BLM.

Karen Ogle, Fire Ecologist, M.S. Colorado State Univ., B.S. Colorado State University, 14 years BLM and U.S. Forest Service.

Craig Olson, Forester, B.S. Colorado State University, 21 years BLM, 5 years U.S. Forest Service.

David Peters, Forester, B.S. Colorado State University, 6 years BLM, 6 years Bureau of Indian Affairs, 7 years Soil Conservation Service.

Marlin Pose, Wildlife Biologist, B.S. Oregon State University, 12 years BLM, 2 years Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Larry Pingel, Fuels Technician, Southern Oregon University, 6 years BLM.

Roger Schnoes, Ecosystem Planner. M.S. Oregon State University. B.S. University of Minnesota. 21 years BLM

Amy Sobiech, Archaeologist. B.S. Southern Illinois University, Forest Resource Management. B.S. Anthropology, Southern Oregon University, 10 years BLM, 4 years U.S. Forest Service.

Rachel Showalter, Botanist. M.S. & B.S. Southern Oregon University. 5 years BLM.

Steve Timmons, Natural Resource Management Specialist - GIS coordinator, B.S. Elizabethtown College, 20 years BLM.

Sherwood Tubman, Ecosystem Planner. B.S. New Mexico State University, 8 years BLM, 3 years Department of Defense, 2 years Soil Conservation Service.

Loren Wittenberg, Hydrologist and Soil Specialist, B.S. Portland State Univ., Natural Resources Institute Graduate, 16 years BLM, 12 years US Geologic Survey.

The Planning Team would like to additionally thank the following people for their assistance in preparing this Landscape Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement:

Lynda Boody	Eric Stone
Jim McConnell	Lynden Werner
Diane Parry	John Styduhar
Ann Ramage	Dave Harmon
Sondra Nolan	Randy Fiske
Doug Henry	Rosey Mazaika
Jim Collins	Jerry Megee
Vince Randall	Louisa Evers
Cindy Walker	Phil Hall
Joe Lint	Chris Cadwell
Mike Hamel	Doug Stewart
Cliff McClelland	Todd Calvert
Marylou Schnoes	Anita Sedaghaty
Lea Light	Colleen Dulin
	Rose Hanrahan

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Oregon Statutory Wildlife Policy, Revised Statute 496.012	<p>Maintain all species of wildlife at optimum levels and prevent the serious depletion of any indigenous species.</p> <p>Develop and manage the lands and water of the state in a manner that will enhance the production and public enjoyment of wildlife.</p> <p>Develop and maintain public access to the lands and waters of the State and the wildlife resources thereon.</p> <p>Regulate wildlife populations and public enjoyment of wildlife in a manner that is compatible with primary uses of the lands and waters of the State and provide optimum public recreational benefits.</p>	<p>All alternatives meet the objectives of this statute. The Action Alternatives would have some short-term affects on population of species dependent on old-growth conifer forest, but these effects have been analyzed in the RMP.</p> <p>Public access would be maintained in all alternatives, except to short, dead end spur roads.</p> <p>The habitat management in all alternatives would be conducive to most wildlife populations. Alternative 4 would be most beneficial to late-successional species.</p>
Oregon Threatened and Endangered Species Act	Protect and conserve wildlife species that are determined to be threatened or endangered.	All State species found within the planning area are also federally listed under the Endangered Species Act. The protection of these species is common in all alternatives.
Oregon's Sensitive Species Rule	Help prevent species from qualifying for listing as threatened or endangered	Most species on Oregon's sensitive species list would be well protected under all alternatives.
Nongame wildlife	Plan to maintain populations of naturally occurring Oregon nongame wildlife at self-sustaining levels within natural geographic ranges in a manner which provides for optimum recreational, scientific and cultural benefits, and where possible, is consistent with primary uses of lands and waters of the State.	Most species on Oregon's nongame wildlife species would be well protected under all alternatives. Some localized adverse impacts would occur due to logging, but overall nongame wildlife populations and habitat would be maintained.

Table 5-1. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Big Game Population Management Objectives	Develop, restore and/or maintain big game (along with associated recreation, aesthetic and commercial opportunities and benefits) at the level identified as the planning target level by game management unit. This is accomplished through hunting season regulation and implementation of multiple-use management practices on public lands that tend to stabilize the cover-forage relationship in space and time, provide for wildlife emphasis in management of sensitive wintering areas, and offer habitat improvement opportunities.	The habitat for big game would be enhanced to differing degrees through the different alternatives as logging would create new forage areas and road closures would reduce harassment. The Mule Creek subwatershed has been designated as an elk management area and open road densities have been reduced through gating roads. The DEIS would not affect this subwatershed.
Wild Fish Policy	Protect and enhance wild stocks	The Aquatic Conservation Strategy would provide adequate protection given the proposals in the action alternatives.
Coho, Steelhead and Trout Plans	Maintain and enhance production.	The maintenance and enhancement of aquatic habitat for these species is common in all alternatives. The Aquatic Conservation Strategy provides for protection of aquatic habitat.
Basin Fish Management Plans	Establish compatible objectives for management of all fish stocks in each basin. Present tasks for attaining objectives, described unacceptable management strategies, and set priorities on achievement.	The maintenance and enhancement of aquatic habitat for all fish stocks is common in all alternatives. The maintenance and enhancement of aquatic habitat for these species is common in all alternatives. The Aquatic Conservation Strategy provides for protection of aquatic habitat.

Table 5-2. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Oregon Department of Forestry

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Oregon Forest Practices Act Rules	Establish minimum standards which encourage and enhance the growing and harvesting of trees while considering and protecting other environmental resources such as air, water, soil, and wildlife	The harvest prescriptions and logging methods proposed in the action alternatives surpass the requirements of the Oregon Forest Practices Act Rules.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Forest Use.	Preserve the forest land base of Oregon. Stabilize the present commercial forest land base. Manage habitat based on sound research data and the recognition that forests are dynamic and most forest uses are compatible over time.	None of the alternatives propose any changes to the forest land base.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Timber Growth and Harvest	Promote the maximum level of sustainable timber growth and harvest on all forest lands available for timber production, consistent with applicable laws and regulations and taking into consideration landowner objectives.	The management emphases for lands within the planning area would be dictated by the land use allocations in the RMP. There would be very small change in land use allocation acreage in Alternatives 2 and 4 through designation of an Area of Critical Environmental Concern.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Recreation, Fish and Wildlife, Grazing, and other Forest Uses	Encourage appropriate opportunities for other forest uses, such as fish and wildlife habitat, grazing, recreation and scenic values on all forest lands, consistent with landowner objectives. A full range of recreational opportunities is encouraged. Where needed to reduce harassment and/or overharvest of wildlife, road closure programs are supported. Integration of sound grazing management practices compatible with timber management goals and wildlife habitat goals is encouraged	All alternatives provide opportunities for other forest uses. Recreation, wildlife habitat, fuels reduction, visual resource protection and other uses would be considered and managed consistent with RMP and state guidelines.
Forestry Program for Oregon – Forest Protection	Devise and use environmentally sound and economically efficient strategies to protect Oregon's forest from wildfire, insect, disease, and other damaging agents. Use integrated pest management. Employ cost-effective fire management policies that emphasize planned ignition fires over natural ignition fires and that consider impacts to the State's forest fire protection program.	Forest protection practices would continue under all alternatives. The fire suppression level would be modified in some areas to reduce adverse impacts to other resources, but forest protection would not suffer. The fuels reduction proposals in the action alternatives are designed to reduce fuel hazards in high priority areas.

Table 5-3. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Land Conservation and Development Commission and other agencies.

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
State Planning Goal 5	Open spaces, scenic and historical areas, and natural resources.	All alternatives conform with this goal as management proposals tier to the RMP which has already been determined to conform.
Statewide Planning Goals – Citizen Involvement	To develop a citizen involvement program that insures the opportunity for citizens to be involved in all phases of the planning process. Federal and other agencies shall coordinate their planning efforts with the affected government bodies and make use of existing local citizen involvement programs established by cities and counties.	BLM's land use planning process provides for public input at various stages. Public input was specifically requested in developing issues. Public input will continue to be utilized in development of the final RMP. Coordination with affected government agencies, including the ODF and ODF&W, has been ongoing and will continue.
Statewide Planning Goals – Land Use Planning	To establish a land use process and policy framework as a basis for all decisions related to use of land and to assure an adequate factual base for such decisions and actions.	Alternatives in the DEIS have been developed in accordance with land use planning process authorized by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 which provides a policy framework for all decisions and actions. This includes issue identification, inventories and evaluation of alternatives.
Statewide Planning Goals – Agricultural Lands	To preserve and maintain existing commercial agricultural lands for farm, consistent with existing and future needs for agricultural products, forest, and open space.	None of the alternatives affect the use of lands for agricultural use.

Table 5-3. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Land Conservation and Development Commission and other agencies.

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
<p>Statewide Planning Goals – Open Spaces, Scenic and Historic Areas, and Natural Resources</p>	<p>To conserve open space and protect natural and scenic resources.</p> <p>Programs shall be provided that will (1) insure open space; (2) protect scenic and historic areas and natural resources for future generations, and (3) promote healthy and visually attractive environments in harmony with the natural landscape character. The location, quality and quantity of the following resources shall be inventoried: Land needed or desirable for open space;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Mineral and aggregate resources; b) Energy sources; c) Fish and wildlife areas and habitats; d) Ecologically and scientifically significant natural area e) Outstanding scenic views and sites; f) Water areas, wetlands, watersheds, and ground water resources; g) Wilderness areas; h) Historic areas; i) Cultural areas; j) Potential and approved Oregon recreation trails; k) Potential and approved Federal wild and scenic waterways and state scenic waterways. <p>Where no conflicting uses for such resources have been identified, such resources shall be managed to preserve their original character. Where conflicting uses have been identified, the economic, social, environmental, and energy consequences of the conflicting uses shall be determined and programs developed to achieve the goal.</p>	<p>Natural, historic and visual resources were considered in the development of the alternatives. In this remote area with very little non-federal lands, there are no conflicts with open space objectives.</p>

Table 5-3. Consistency of Proposed Action Alternatives with State of Oregon Plans: Land Conservation and Development Commission and other agencies.

State Plan/Statute	Objective	Consistency of Alternatives
Statewide Planning Goals – Air, Water, and Land Resources Quality	To maintain and improve the quality of the air, water, and land resources of the state.	Federal and state water quality standards would be met, water quality would be maintained and/or improved under all alternatives. Burning vegetation slash under all alternatives would have slight temporary effect on air quality. All actions would comply with statewide Smoke Management Plan and the State Implementation Plan.
Statewide Planning Goals – Areas subject to Natural Disaster and hazards	To protect life and property from natural disaster and hazards.	No conflicts with natural disaster goals were identified. New road construction would be very limited and located in stable areas. Proposed harvest units were examined on the ground for instability.
Statewide Planning Goals – Recreational Needs	To satisfy the recreational needs of the citizens of the state and visitors and, where appropriate, to provide for the siting of necessary recreational facilities, including destination resorts. Federal agency recreation plans shall be coordinated with local and regional recreational needs and plans.	Recreational opportunities would be maintained at present levels under all alternatives. Recreational demand is very limited in this remote area, except along the Rogue River corridor, which would not be affected by any of the alternatives.
Statewide Planning Goals – Economy of the State	To diversify and improve the economy of the state.	The alternatives would not change the economic contribution of these lands from those disclosed in the RMP.
Statewide Planning Goals – Public Facilities and Services	To plan and develop a timely, orderly, and efficient arrangement of public facilities and services to serve as a framework for urban and rural development	No need for additional public facilities was identified for this planning area.
Statewide Planning Goals – Transportation	To provide and encourage a safe, convenient and economical transportation system.	The alternatives would maintain the existing transportation system, with minor changes by constructing two new road segments in Alternative 1 and decommissioning 10-15 miles of existing dead end spur roads under various alternatives. Access to private lands and existing rights would be maintained
Statewide Planning Goals – Energy Conservation	To conserve energy.	No conflicts with conservation and efficient use of energy sources were identified. No opportunities for additional contributions to energy conservation were identified.

Index

Access 3-34, 4-15
Air Quality 2-10, 3-49, 4-45
Anadromous fish 3-10, 3-31
Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) 2-23, 2-25, 3-10, 3-12, 3-20, 3-25, 3-35, 3-47, 3-48, 3-52, 4-44
Back Country Byway 3-37
Best management practices (BMP=s) 2-4, 3-10, 4-46
Communication site 3-18
Critical habitat 3-19, 3-25, 4-36, 4-28
Cultural resources 2-17, 3-44, 4-43
Cumulative effects 4-47
Employment 3-38, 3-40, 3-46, 4-42
Endangered species (see Threatened and endangered species) 1-11, 3-33, 4-7
Fire management xvi, 1-4, 2-9, 2-18, 2-21, 2-24, 2-25, 3-16, 4-9, 4-26, A-10
Fish 3-31, 3-33, 4-39
Groundwater 3-9, 4-5
Hazardous materials 3-52, 4-46
Irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources 4-47
Late Successional Habitat 1-5, 2-12, 2-19, 3-20, 4-19, 4-29
Mineral extraction 3-43
Mining 3-46, 4-41
Mitigation 3-50
Monitoring 2-25, 3-51, 4-4, A-73
Native American 3-17, 3-40, 3-44, 3-48, 4-43
Old Growth 3-10, 3-11, 3-25, 4-37
Planning criteria 1-10
Port-Orford cedar 3-16, 4-30
Recreation 3-37, 3-43, 4-41
Research Natural Area 1-8, 2-25, 3-3, 3-48, 4-44
Rights-of-way 3-36, A-72
Riparian zone 3-9, 4-5
Roads xv, 1-6, 2-15, 2-20, 2-22, 2-24, 2-26, 3-34, 4-15, 4-25, 4-40, A-37, A-72
Rural interface 3-36, 4-15, 4-41
Scenic resources 4-42
Sensitive species 2-14, 3-24
Smoke management 2-10, 3-49, 3-51
Soils 2-16, 3-9, 4-4, A-66
Threatened and endangered species 2-13, 3-33, 4-7, 4-31, A-51
Timber Management 1-4, 2-3, 2-11, 2-19, 2-22, 2-24, 2-26, 3-19, 4-13, A-70
Vegetation 3-11, 4-7, A-49
Visual resources 3-38
Water quality 3-10, 4-6
Wetlands 3-9, 3-24, 4-5
Wild and Scenic rivers 3-49, 4-44
Wilderness 1-6, 1-7, 1-8, 3-48, 4-44
Wilderness and Wild Scenic Rivers xiv, 2-4, 4-41, 5-4, A-153+

